



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,530	07/11/2005	Hubert Baumgart	PAT-00344	4046
77224	7590	10/02/2008	EXAMINER	
Mary E. Golota			FRANK, NOAH S	
Cantor Colburn LLP				
201 W. Big Beaver Road			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 1101				
Troy, MI 48084			1796	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/02/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

MARJORIE.ELLIS@BASF.COM
Mgolota@CantorColburn.com
cdavenport@cantorcolburn.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/541,530	BAUMGART ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NOAH FRANK	1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12 and 17-28 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-12 and 17-28 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12, 17-18, 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nienhaus et al. (WO 02/31071 using US 6,903,145 as the English translation) in view of Ohrbom et al. (EP 0 915 113).

Considering Claims 1-8, 11-12: Neinhaus et al. teaches a multicomponent system comprising (A) at least one component comprising at least two isocyanate-reactive functional groups, (B) one component containing a polyisocyanate, and (C) a component comprising at least two constituents which are curable with actinic radiation (Abs). Preferred compounds (A) are (meth)acrylate copolymers containing hydroxyl groups (4:10-15) and a preferred compound (C) is dipentaerythritol pentaacrylate (8:25-35, Table 1). Additionally, the composition may further comprise amino resin crosslinking agents such as those taught in “Carbamylmethylated Melamines” (5:20-35). The amino resin crosslinking agents are the same referenced in the instant application and are therefore assumed to meet all of the claimed limitations. The system can be used as a clearcoat (13:45-50).

Neinhaus does not teach a component comprising at least two allophanate or carbamate groups. However, Ohrbom et al. teaches a dual-cure system comprising a

compound having hydroxyl functionality and carbamate functionality, or a compound having carbamate functionality and a compound having hydroxyl functionality, and an aminoplast crosslinker (2:50-60). Preferred compounds having carbamate functionality are acrylic resins having at least two carbamate groups per molecule (7:35-45).

Neinhaus and Blum are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely polyisocyanate/polyurethane dual cure coating systems. At the time of the invention a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have used compounds having carbamate functionality, as taught by Ohrbom, in the invention of Neinhaus, in order to provide rheology control and environmental etch resistance in systems curing also through crosslinking of hydroxyl groups with polyisocyanate crosslinkers (2:5-10 of Ohrbom).

Neinhaus does not teach the claimed NCO:OH or carbamate:methylol ratios. However, Ohrbom teaches that an NCO:OH ratio of about 0.7:1 and a carbamate:methylol ratio of about 1:0.6 (3:36-45). At the time of the invention a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have used the ratios, as taught by Ohrbom, in the invention of Neinhaus, in order to effectively crosslink the composition.

Considering Claim 9: Neinhaus does not teach component B comprising a minor amount of allophanate or carbamate groups. However, Ohrbom teaches incorporating carbamate functionality via hydroxyethyl carbamates (¶0033). At the time of the invention a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have used a

hydroxyethyl carbamate, as taught by Ohrbom, in the invention of Neinhaus, as part of component B, in order to incorporate extra carbamate functionality in the system.

Considering Claim 10: Neinhaus does not teach allophanate groups, which falls within the claimed range of up to 30%.

Considering Claim 17: Neinhaus teaches using blocked polyisocyanates (5:40).

Considering Claim 18: Neinhaus teaches using isocyanates having at least one group which can be activated with actinic radiation (8:45-65).

Considering Claim 20: Neinhaus teaches the isocyanate component comprising from 20 to 80% by weight of isocyanate (7:30-40).

Considering Claim 21: Neinhaus teaches using additives (4:40-45).

Considering Claim 22: Neinhaus teaches the mixture curable thermally and with actinic radiation (2:55-60).

Considering Claim 23: Neinhaus teaches mixing and homogenizing the components (3:10-15).

Considering Claims 25-26: Neinhaus teaches using the coating materials for automotive refinishing (11:1-5).

Claims 19, 24, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nienhaus et al. (WO 02/31071 using US 6,903,145 as the English translation) in view of Ohrbom et al. (EP 0 915 113), as applied to claims 1-12, 17-18, 20-23 above, and further in view of Blum et al. (WO 02/02704 using US 6,803,393 as the English translation).

Considering Claims 19 and 27-28: Neinhaus et al. teaches the basic claimed composition as set forth above. In addition, Neinhaus teaches the polyiscyanate containing component comprising from 20 to 80% by weight of polyisocyanate (7:35-40).

Neinhaus does not teach the other claimed weight percentages. However, Blum et al, teaches multicomponent systems comprising (A3) 1 to 50% by weight isocyanate reactive polymers having actinic groups (9:1-17), (A2) 1 to 50% by weight isocyanate reactive polymer/oligomers (9:1-17), (A1) 1 to 60% by weight actinic group containing compound (5:59-64), and 1 to 50% by weight of amino resin and isocyanate crosslinking agents (14:12-17). Neinhaus and Blum are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely multicomponent dual-cure systems. At the time of the invention a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have used the weight percentages, as taught by Blum, in the invention of Neinhaus, in order to effectively crosslink the composition.

Considering Claim 24: Neinhaus et al. teaches the basic claimed composition as set forth above.

Neinhaus does not teach the claimed weight ratio. However, Blum et al, teaches using 1 to 50% by weight of crosslinking agents (14:16-28). At the time of the invention a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have used the weight ratio, as taught by Blum, in the invention of Neinhaus, in order to effectively crosslink the composition.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/9/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments that Neinhaus teaches a different use for the amino resin, both Neinhaus and Ohrbom teach alkylated melamine resins (¶0052 of Ohrbom). While they would behave differently in a system comprised solely of the invention of Neinhaus, versus one that incorporates the invention of Ohrbom, the skilled artisan would still know to incorporate alkylated melamine crosslinkers in the combined invention.

In response to applicant's arguments regarding the combinability of Nienhaus and Ohrbom, the Examiner has relied on Ohrbom to teach the incorporation of another type of curing, namely thermal curing via carbamate functionality. While both are not multicomponent systems, they are still similar enough that the ordinary artisan could easily have looked to Ohrbom to incorporate a secondary cure method.

In response to applicant's arguments regarding the motivation to combine Ohrbom with Nienhaus, Ohrbom gives such motivation, namely in order to provide rheology control and environmental etch resistance in systems curing also through crosslinking of hydroxyl groups with polyisocyanate crosslinkers (2:5-10 of Ohrbom).

In response to applicant's arguments regarding KSR, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined

teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art.

See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

In response to applicant's arguments regarding unexpected results and the incorporation of those into the claims, the Examiner did not mean to infer that unexpected results must be claimed, but that those results would be inherent in a multicomponent system taught by Nienhaus in view of Ohrbom.

In response to applicant's arguments regarding claim 9, please see the new rejection as set forth above.

In response to applicant's arguments regarding claim 10, please see the new rejection as set forth above.

In response to applicant's arguments regarding Blum, while the components do not match up completely, they are close enough to constitute a teaching of the general ratios that the skilled artisan would use. The substantial difference is that component A3 of Blum does not have reactive carbamate groups and component A2 does not have methacrylate groups. However, overall, Blum contains a very similar composition of a compound having actinic groups (A3), a compound having isocyanate-reactive functionality (A2), an amino resin, and a compound having actinic groups (A1).

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NOAH FRANK whose telephone number is (571)270-3667. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on 571-272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mark Eashoo, Ph.D./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796
27-Sep-08

NF
9-15-08